

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated March 2, 2011. Claims 19, 22, 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 38 and 42 have been amended. Claims 19-42 remain in the application with Claims 19, 27 and 35 being the only independent claims. Favorable reconsideration, in view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, is respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner has objected to Claim 38 for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 2-3 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 19-42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 3-4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 19-42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On page 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 26, 34 and 42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the reasons noted therein. It is believed that the above changes to the claims overcome this rejection.

On pages 5-6 of the Official Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 19-34 and 36-41 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, set forth therein. It is believed that the above amendments to these claims overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, it is believed that independent Claims 19 and 27, along with their associated dependent Claims 20-26 and 28-34, respectively, are in condition for allowance. Regarding independent Claim 35, this claim has been amended to include the subject matter of Claims 19 and 27 which the Examiner has noted in his statement of reasons for allowance on page 5 of the Official Action contains allowable subject matter. Specifically, Claim 35 now recites in part *“forming by a piercing operation a first window portion in a wheel disc ...”* and *“forming by a piercing operation a second window portion in the wheel disc which cooperates with the first window*

portion to define a single pierced window in the wheel disc ...". (Emphasis added). Accordingly, it is believed that independent Claim 35, along with its associated dependent Claims 36-42,

On pages 4-5 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 35 and 42 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ono (U.S. Patent No. 7,523,635). [Note: the Examiner cited "Coleman (2003/0080606)" in the rejection heading but it is clear that he meant to cite the Ono patent since his detailed reasons for rejection used the disclosure from the Ono patent and not Coleman]. For the reasons discussed above, these rejections are respectfully believed to be moot in view of the above amendments to the claims and accompanying remarks.

In view of the above amendments and accompanying remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner does not believe that the above remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please contact Applicants' attorney by telephone at (419) 255-5900 to discuss this application prior to the issuance of a further action in this case by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas V. Pavelko/
Douglas V. Pavelko
Reg. No. 36,888

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900